



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

likely that we have in this locution one of the ancestors of the French *donner du pain*, etc.

The datives in Rud. 956a *noveram dominum id quod fiebat* and 958, *ego istuc furtum scio quod factum est* are classified (170) as datives of agency. Professor Bennett supplies in the first passage *eius* (with *dominum*) and translates by "the master of him by whom that was done". But *dominus* here means 'owner' (of the *vidulus*). This is the passage in which Trachalio, having seized the rope, is relating to Gripus a little tale to inform the latter that his prize (the *vidulus*) is really stolen, since Trachalio knows the owner. *erus*, the regular word for 'master', and *dominus* are often synonymous in Plautus (compare Am. 586 f.), but all through this passage *dominus* means 'owner' (see 959, 961a, 965, 1021). At 1038 Gripus agrees to submit the question to his master (*erus*) and the same passage proves that *dominus*, 956a, etc., cannot refer to his master, since Trachalio would never have accepted Gripus's master as the umpire if he had known his identity (compare the next scene). Verse 956a means, therefore, 'I knew the owner against (for) whom that theft was committed' (so 958), and the datives are datives of disadvantage (see page 155 for *facio* with such datives).

A work containing so many thousands of facts necessarily involves many points about which scholars will differ, but there can be no doubt that it is an indispensable aid to the study of early Latin. It is to be hoped, therefore, that Professor Bennett will be able to complete his task in the near future.

BYRN MAWR COLLEGE.

ARTHUR L. WHEELER.

Roman Cooks. By Cornelia Gaskins Harcum. Johns Hopkins Dissertation. Baltimore: J. H. Furst Company. (1914).

This study, a companion piece to Edwin Moore Rankin's monograph on The Role of the *Μάρτυροι* in the Life of the Ancient Greeks (Chicago, 1907), is an attempt to bring together all the literary and epigraphic evidence on the cook and his calling. The first chapter discusses the Latin word for cook, in connection with which the use of *coquina ars*, and of *coquina* as a substantive, might have been considered; see Archiv für Lateinische Lexicographie 10.238. It may be noted that the cook's office is spoken of as an 'art' as early as Terence (Andria 30); interesting too is Horace's *cenarum ars* (Serm. 2.4.35), which of course includes more than mere cookery.

Next comes a brief sketch of the development of cooking as a fine art, followed by chapters on the nationality of cooks, their names, their characteristics, their cost, and their social position, besides a consideration of the *macellum* and of the *collegia* of cooks. A great amount of interesting material is assembled and every phase of the subject is adequately treated. The chapter on names of cooks (25-38) is of particular interest: it consists of an alphabetical list gathered from inscriptions and from the literary sources, followed by an examination of the characteristics of the names. Some of the matter relating to the comic force of the appellatives is to be found in Mendelsohn's Studies in the Word-Play in Plautus 56 (University of Pennsylvania Studies in Philology and Literature 12, No. 2, Philadelphia, 1907.)

The amount of material in a dissertation of this character is so great that its sponsors can verify but a small part of the references, while the reviewer must confine his tests to a limited number of passages. If any of the latter yield instances of inaccuracy, it is unfortunate, since the element of chance may be responsible for an unfair estimate of the soundness of the work as a whole. On page 48 the quotation from Suetonius, Vitellius 13, is surely wrong. The dainties are said to have been brought "as far as from the Carpathian Sea". That is not a very impressive distance, and what Suetonius really says is a Parthia usque fretoque Hispanico, that is, from one end of the Roman world to the other. The conjecture *Carpathio* for *Parthia* is found in no modern text, and, even if one were to adopt it, the meaning would be 'from the Carpathian Sea to the Spanish Strait', which is practically from one end of the Roman Empire to the other, so far as seaways are concerned. Holland, in his Translation of Suetonius, has "as far as from the Carpathian sea", but rightly adds "and the straits of Spaine". Is it possible that the source of the quotation was a translation, and that it was not verified by a comparison with Roth, Preud'homme, or Ihm?

In its literary form the work leaves something to be desired. With due allowance for modern parsimony in the use of commas, perhaps a natural reaction against the extravagance of bygone days, the punctuation is faulty and often misleading. As examples may be cited: page 13, "To cater to such connoisseurs in the art of eating a very expert cook was necessarily required"; page 20, "the cooks in Plautus are slaves and not free men as they were in Greek comedy from which his cooks, if Greek, would most probably be taken". This is carried into German on page 15, where a quotation from Leo is made obscure by mispunctuation; and into Latin on page 17, where a passage from Livy is all but unintelligible because of misplaced commas. On pages 58 and 59 essential marks of punctuation are lacking in three successive quotations from Plautus.

Repetitions are too frequent. Martial's tale of the cook who performed such culinary miracles is given no less than three times (pages 13, 47, and 57); the inscription C. I. L. XI. 3078 is printed in full twice (pages 16 and 78), the second time with no obvious reason; the cook's boast in Plautus Pseud. 804 appears on pages 19 and 40. With a little more care, too, some awkward sentences might have been avoided: e. g. page 11, "Then, as Livy xxxix, 6, puts it, *tum coquus*", etc.: "in his *Antony*, xxxviii, Plutarch also tells another story"; page 12, "the luxurious propensities of Nero, Caligula and Heliogabalus. The latter, according to Lampridius . . ."; page 22, "Croesus honored the woman who made his bread with a statue of gold"; page 62, "In the former country, as we have seen, the cook was never represented as a slave in comedy, with possibly the exception of one author. . . ; nor have we any other evidence for believing that he was a slave until Macedonian times". "An Asia Minor name" (p. 22) seems dubious English.

The proof-reading appears to be very well done; I have noted only *Ephproditus* (35).

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

Tacitus, Agricola and Germania. Edited by William Francis Allen. Revised by Katharine Allen and G. L. Hendrickson. Boston: Ginn & Co. (1913). Pp. xv + 173. \$1.00.

This is an excellent revision of an excellent edition, which has survived the test of a generation. The revision has been thorough-going. The text has been conservatively reconstituted in the light of the recently discovered Toledo and Jesi manuscripts. Tables show-

ing the chief deviations of the new text from that of the old edition and of Halm are given on pages 113-117, 171-173. The new Introduction to the Germania and the essay on The Form of the Agricola have been contributed by Professor Hendrickson. A single-page map of the British Isles to illustrate the Agricola, and a double-page map of Germany (based on Gudeman), and brief revised bibliographies (111-112, 169-170) are useful additions. Professor Hendrickson and Miss Allen have collaborated in the revision of the text and the Commentary, particularly in the case of the Agricola. The Commentary shows a very considerable accession of material, although as the result of the use of small type the bulk of the book has been but little increased (from about 146 to 188 pages).

It is a tribute to the scholarship of the late Professor William Francis Allen that so little change, relatively, was thought necessary in his succinct and eminently sane notes. From the old commentary have been excised the names of many authorities; discussions of most textual points have been relegated to the appendices; some matters of interpretation, formerly mooted, are now briefly stated as certain. Grammatical and historical references have been brought down to date; citations, particularly from the works of Tacitus, are printed in greater number; and many additional references to Seneca, the Elder and the Younger Pliny, Strabo and Dio enrich the notes. A relatively large amount of new material has been added illustrating the Roman remains in Britain, the stations of the Roman legions, the provincial administration of the early Empire, and the Romanization of Britain. Naturally, in the light of recent investigations in the fields of Germanic history and philology, many changes have been made in the notes to the Germania. Nevertheless the general impression is left, that most of the careful conclusions of the late Professor Allen remain unchanged. In order to meet the requirements of the College students of our day, the new edition furnishes much additional help in the way of syntactical explanations, translation, and the elucidation of the highly rhetorical style.

As the present generation of American college students has grown up without drill in the old formal rhetoric (a deficiency deplored by many of the teachers of English!), and as the value of a knowledge of the old norms of diction and style is recognized, the burden resting on the instructor in Latin of interpreting the stylistic as well as the historical significance of ancient texts has been increased several fold. In fact it may be affirmed that in many cases the chief substantive value accruing from the study of these little monographs by Tacitus is on the ethical, psychological, and stylistic side, although the historical content, when it is adequately interpreted, has a value not to be disputed. Whether the revisers would agree with me, I do not know. Their aim was to interpret Tacitus, as far as possible, from the same point of view as Professor Allen. In this they have succeeded, and they have also added many notes on the rhetorical coloring of the Tacitean style. Perhaps wisely, the systematic presentation of the author's style is left to the instructor.

The revision is attractively printed. I have noticed only a few misprints; several Greek accents are awry. Several errors in the old Commentary are reprinted. But considering the difficulties of the task the book is an honor to American scholarship.

UNION COLLEGE.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

## A REJOINDER

May I correct errors in the review of my edition of the Andria (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 8.183)? The spelling *Cremes* is not "annotated in 247, 361, 368, 472, 538, 550". These notes, on various inflectional forms of the word are all needed by the young student. On 753 I carefully call *faxim* and *sim* subjunctives and then state that they were originally optatives. The note on *fieri* (792—not 972, as the review has it) needs no correction, although I might well have added the words "in Terence". The word-form "excellencies" (page 37) is correct. I am grateful for the correction of *Aihenas* (907) to *Atenas*: but why need this, the sole error the reviewer detected, be characterized as an "oversight" in the second paragraph and as a "misprint" in the fifth?

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

## THE CLASSICAL CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA

The Classical Club of Philadelphia held its 120th meeting on April 23. Fifty members—a record attendance—were present. Professor Duane Reed Stuart, of Princeton University, read a scholarly and interesting paper on Modern Criticism of the Ancient Lives of Vergil, Professor W. W. Baker, of Haverford College, read a curious sixteenth century poem, *De Miseria Paedagogorum*. An Ode of Horace set to really meritorious music by a boy of the Central High School, Philadelphia, was shown. The officers elected were: President, Stanley R. Yarnall; Vice-President, George Depue Hadzsits; Secretary-Treasurer, B. W. Mitchell.

B. W. MITCHELL, *Secretary*.

In connection with the note by Dr. C. C. Mierow, above, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 8,208, illustrating by a parallel, from contemporary European War History, a statement made centuries ago by the historian Jordanes concerning the changes wrought by war in the habits of birds, the following extract from The Nation of April 1, 1915 (page 363) may be of interest:

"A number of correspondents of *Nature* report that the battle in the North Sea, on January 24 was accompanied by much disturbance among pheasants in Lincolnshire, Yorkshire, and even in Cumberland. The disturbance was noticeable between 9.45 and 10.30 A. M., that is, as we know from Sir David Beattie's report, at the time when the Blücher received its principle injuries before sinking. In woods near Burgh-le-Marsh, in Lincolnshire, the guns were heard simultaneously with the crowing of the pheasants. Canon Rawnskey, who has collected many reports on the subject, infers that "the pheasant's ear is capable of receiving impressions from sound waves that the human ear cannot respond to", but Dr. Davison suggests that the disturbance might be caused by the sudden swaying of low trees and undergrowth during the passage of the air-waves. He directs attention to the fact that, during a naval review at Cherbourg on July 18, 1900, reports were heard for 107 miles".

C. K.